

Ly, Anh

From: Sandra Parker [sandramparker@charter.net]
Sent: Friday, October 20, 2006 12:54 PM
To: Corrielus, Jean M.; Ly, Anh
Subject: Fw: 09/628,599

Dear Examiners,

I have not received an allowance, your response or a phone call regarding this application. I left a message with Examiner Ly but it was not returned.

I am again forwarding you my e-mails and the authorization.

Please respond asap or call me at 562/597-7504.

Thanks,

Sandra Parker

----- Original Message -----

From: "Sandra Parker" <sandramparker@charter.net>
To: "Corrielus, Jean M." <Jean.Corrielus@USPTO.GOV>; "Ly, Anh"
<Anh.Ly@USPTO.GOV>

Sent: Wednesday, August 16, 2006 9:54 AM

Subject: 09/628,599

> Dear Examiner Corrielus,
> thank you for your voice message. As per Examiner Ly's phone call, he will
> talk to you about the change you require to see either in the
> specification or the claims so that this application is allowed. The
> subject matter of claim 3 can be found, in addition of page 7 that you
> wrote about in Examiner's Interview Summary, also on pages 4, 6 and 8, as
> I indicated to him and tried to tell you during our interviews. Please
> check all the claims and inform me about the ones that you are having
> problems with.
>
> I requested a written Authorization for e-mailing from the Assignee and
> hope to get it soon.
> Best regards,
> Sandra Parker

Ly, Anh

From: Sandra Parker [sandramparker@charter.net]
Sent: Friday, October 20, 2006 12:55 PM
To: Corrielus, Jean M.; Ly, Anh
Subject: Fw: 09/628,599

----- Original Message -----

From: "Sandra Parker" <sandramparker@charter.net>
To: "Corrielus, Jean M." <Jean.Corrielus@USPTO.GOV>; "Ly, Anh"
<Anh.Ly@USPTO.GOV>
Sent: Wednesday, August 16, 2006 1:50 PM
Subject: you know the appl. number

> Dear Examiners,
>
> please find enclosed the further explanation of where the language of
> claims 3 and 6 is found in the Specification.
>
> 1. Lines 3-4 of claim 3 are described in three places: on p. 8, li. 5-7,
> p. 3 li. 7 and p. 7, li 13-14. Line 5 of claim 3 is described on p. 7,
> li. 15-17.
>
> 2. Line 2 of claim 6 is described on p. 3, li. 8, etc.
>
> Page 7 li. 13-14 states that a pointer is replaced with a pointer, instead
> of the claim 3 language that the first OPCODE is augmented with a
> replacement pointer. However, this is clear when we look on li. 8 of claim
> 1. Because there the OPCODE is augmented with a pointer (cl. 1), when we
> replace that pointer with another pointer (Spec. p. 7, 13-14), the OPCODE
> (cl. 1) also gets augmented with the second pointer (cl. 3). Therefore,
> the language of claim 3 is correct - we started at OPCODE and that is what
> we are augmenting with a pointer. Moreover, the language on p. 3 and p. 8
> is exactly the same as in the claim 3.
>
> Therefore, I do not believe that there is any ambiguity or incorrect
> language in the claims.
> Please call me at 562/597-7504 to discuss.
>
> Thanks,
> Sandra Parker
>

Ly, Anh

From: Sandra Parker [sandramparker@charter.net]
Sent: Friday, October 20, 2006 12:56 PM
To: Corrielus, Jean M.; Ly, Anh
Subject: Fw: 09/628,599

----- Original Message -----

From: "Sandra Parker" <sandramparker@charter.net>
To: "Corrielus, Jean M." <Jean.Corrielus@USPTO.GOV>; "Ly, Anh"
<Anh.Ly@USPTO.GOV>
Sent: Wednesday, August 16, 2006 2:03 PM
Subject: me again, sorry

> P.S. Pardon my analogy here but claim 3 language means:
>
> In cl. 1 a book of matches (OPCODE) is augmented with a green lighter (a
> pointer).
>
> In cl. 3, the green lighter is replaced with a red lighter. Therefore, the
> matches (OPCODE) of cl. 1 are augmented with a red lighter (second
> pointer) here.

Ly, Anh

From: Sandra Parker [sandramparker@charter.net]
Sent: Friday, October 20, 2006 12:56 PM
To: Corrielus, Jean M.; Ly, Anh
Subject: Fw: 09/628, 599

----- Original Message -----

From: "Sandra Parker" <sandramparker@charter.net>
To: "Corrielus, Jean M." <Jean.Corrielus@USPTO.GOV>; "Ly, Anh"
<Anh.Ly@USPTO.GOV>
Sent: Friday, August 18, 2006 12:14 PM
Subject: 09/628, 599

> Dear Examiners,
> I just faxed the Assignee's Authorization to Examiner Ly's fax.
>
> I am grateful that Examiner Corrielus promised to review my two e-mails
> explaining the three places in the Specification that describe the subject
> matter of the only claim 3 that he is objecting to, before he leaves for
> vacation.
>
> I am grateful to Examiner Ly for calling today and stating that he does
> not have a problem. I am sorry that he is busy and had not had a chance to
> talk to the Supervisory Examiner Corrielus.
>
> I do not see any problems with the claims. However, I would agree to an
> amendment to p. 7 of the Specification for clarification, if needed.
>
> Please review my e-mails and several lines on the three pages of
> Specification. You can reach me by phone or send me an e-mail.
>
> Thanks,
> Sandra Parker

Ly, Anh

From: Sandra Parker [sandramparker@charter.net]
Sent: Friday, October 20, 2006 12:56 PM
To: Corrielus, Jean M.; Ly, Anh
Subject: Fw: 09/628,599



18-spec.doc

----- Original Message -----

From: "Sandra Parker" <sandramparker@charter.net>
To: "Corrielus, Jean M." <Jean.Corrielus@USPTO.GOV>; "Ly, Anh"
<Anh.Ly@USPTO.GOV>
Sent: Friday, August 18, 2006 12:37 PM
Subject: 09/628,599

> P.S. If necessary, I can amend the second full paragraph of p.7 of the
> Specification as shown in the attachment.

>

According to another aspect of the pre-pass mechanism, an intermediate processing function may be inserted either during this pre-pass stage, or at a later processing stage, to provide additional, auxiliary processing capabilities. Instead of using the pointer to the function to call to process the operation specified by the OPCODE is replaced by in this aspect the OPCODE is augmented with a pointer to the intermediate processing function and an auxiliary data structure. The auxiliary data structure includes a pointer to store the pointer to the function to call to process the operation specified by the OPCODE. The intermediate function provides the capability to perform additional, auxiliary processing such as gathering statistics on the function which process the operation specified by the OPCODE, or requesting input from a user via the terminal interface 16, before or after calling the function to process the operation specified by the OPCODE. According to yet another aspect, instead of using the pointer to the function to call to process the operation specified by the OPCODE, the OPCODE is augmented with another pointer which points to the auxiliary data structure.

Ly, Anh

From: Sandra Parker [sandramparker@charter.net]
Sent: Friday, October 20, 2006 12:57 PM
To: Corrielus, Jean M.; Ly, Anh
Subject: Fw: 09/628,599



18-spec.doc

----- Original Message -----

From: "Sandra Parker" <sandramparker@charter.net>
To: "Ly, Anh" <Anh.Ly@USPTO.GOV>
Sent: Monday, August 21, 2006 9:36 AM
Subject: Fw: 09/628,599

> P.S.S. Please inform me today of your decision.

>

> ----- Original Message -----

> From: "Sandra Parker" <sandramparker@charter.net>
> To: "Corrielus, Jean M." <Jean.Corrielus@USPTO.GOV>; "Ly, Anh"
> <Anh.Ly@USPTO.GOV>
> Sent: Friday, August 18, 2006 12:37 PM
> Subject: 09/628,599

>

>

>> P.S. If necessary, I can amend the second full paragraph of p.7 of the
>> Specification as shown in the attachment.

>>

>

According to another aspect of the pre-pass mechanism, an intermediate processing function may be inserted either during this pre-pass stage, or at a later processing stage, to provide additional, auxiliary processing capabilities. Instead of using the pointer to the function to call to process the operation specified by the OPCODE is replaced by in this aspect the OPCODE is augmented with a pointer to the intermediate processing function and an auxiliary data structure. The auxiliary data structure includes a pointer to store the pointer to the function to call to process the operation specified by the OPCODE. The intermediate function provides the capability to perform additional, auxiliary processing such as gathering statistics on the function which process the operation specified by the OPCODE, or requesting input from a user via the terminal interface 16, before or after calling the function to process the operation specified by the OPCODE. According to yet another aspect, instead of using the pointer to the function to call to process the operation specified by the OPCODE, the OPCODE is augmented with another pointer which points to the auxiliary data structure.

Ly, Anh

From: Sandra Parker [sandramparker@charter.net]
Sent: Friday, October 20, 2006 2:19 PM
To: Breene, John
Cc: Corrielus, Jean M.; Ly, Anh
Subject: Fw: 09/628,599

Dear Supervisory Examiner Breene,

I just received a phone call from Examiner Corrielus who informed me that he is no longer involved with this case and that it is now under your supervision. Thus, I am forwarding you all these e-mails, originally sent two months ago when I was assured by the Examiners that this application would be allowed.

Time is of the essence here. Last Office Action, mailed on 7/31/06, although not marked in the Summary as Final, was proclaimed so by the Examiner Ly on its last page and in his subsequent e-mail. This application was under appeal when Examiner Ly continued prosecution instead of filing an Examiner's Brief. I objected to you and the Director by e-mails for which you requested a written authorization which was forwarded to Examiner Ly in August.

However, nothing was done since August despite reassurances that the application is allowable and that neither examiner Ly nor Corrielus had further objections or rejections.

Furthermore, this application was pulled out from PAIR and cannot be reviewed. Although I alerted numerous USPTO personnel, including yourself, it was not put back.

Please review this file asap and call me at 562/597-7504.

Best regards,
Sandra Parker

----- Original Message -----

From: "Sandra Parker" <sandramparker@charter.net>
To: "Corrielus, Jean M." <Jean.Corrielus@USPTO.GOV>; "Ly, Anh"
<Anh.Ly@USPTO.GOV>
Sent: Friday, October 20, 2006 9:54 AM
Subject: Fw: 09/628,599

> Dear Examiners,
> I have not received an allowance, your response or a phone call regarding
> this application. I left a message with Examiner Ly but it was not
> returned.

> I am again forwarding you my e-mails and the authorization.
> Please respond asap or call me at 562/597-7504.
> Thanks,
> Sandra Parker
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: "Sandra Parker" <sandramparker@charter.net>
> To: "Corrielus, Jean M." <Jean.Corrielus@USPTO.GOV>; "Ly, Anh"
> <Anh.Ly@USPTO.GOV>
> Sent: Wednesday, August 16, 2006 9:54 AM
> Subject: 09/628,599
>
>
>> Dear Examiner Corrielus,
>> thank you for your voice message. As per Examiner Ly's phone call, he
>> will talk to you about the change you require to see either in the
>> specification or the claims so that this application is allowed. The
>> subject matter of claim 3 can be found, in addition of page 7 that you
>> wrote about in Examiner's Interview Summary, also on pages 4, 6 and 8, as
>> I indicated to him and tried to tell you during our interviews. Please
>> check all the claims and inform me about the ones that you are having
>> problems with.
>>
>> I requested a written Authorization for e-mailing from the Assignee and
>> hope to get it soon.
>> Best regards,
>> Sandra Parker
>